

Doc Code: XP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

0119-022

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on 09 August 2006

Signature

Typed or printed name Krishna Kalidindi

Application Number

09/418,562

Filed

10/15/1999

First Named Inventor

Jacobus Haartsen

Art Unit

2634

Examiner

Curtis Odom

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☒

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 41,461☐

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

Signature

Krishna Kalidindi

Typed or printed name

(703) 893-8500

Telephone number

09 August 2006

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Application No. 09/418,562
Atty. Docket No. 0119-022

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	Mail Stop AF
)	
Jacobus C. HAARTSEN)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2634
Application No.: 09/418,562)	
)	Examiner: Curtis B. Odom
Filed: October 15, 1999)	
)	Confirmation No. 9055
For: HOP SEQUENCE ADAPTATION)	
IN A FREQUENCY-HOPPING)	
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM)	

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on February 9, 2006, Applicants respectfully request review of the rejections prior to Appeal for at least the following reasons. A Notice of Appeal and a Petition for Extension of Time is being filed concurrently herewith.

1. Bergstrom fails to teach using a time varying parameter to select a substitute hop channel in the present phase

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bergstrom (U.S. Patent No. 4,716,573). Specifically, the Final Office Action relies on Bergstrom for disclosing if the selected hop channel belongs to a set of forbidden hop channels, then: *using a time-varying parameter to select, at the present phase, a substitute hop channel* from the set of allowable hop channels .

Bergstrom is completely silent as to using a time-varying parameter, in the present phase, to select a substitute hop channel. The portions of Bergstrom relied upon in the Office Action (col. 3, lines 13-65 and claim 1) simply do not address the phase or a time-varying parameter.

In an earlier (non-final) Office Action (dated 06/15/2005), the random number generator is analogized to a time-varying parameter when no basis for such interpretation is found in Bergstrom.

2. Bergstrom fails to teach mapping of a forbidden hop channel onto each of the allowable hop channels with equal probability

The Final Office Action also refers to Bergstrom for disclosing, if the selected hop channel belongs to a set of forbidden hop channels, then: using a time-varying parameter to select, at the present phase, a substitute hop channel from the set of allowable hop channels .
..... *wherein a forbidden hop channel is mapped onto each of the allowable hop channels with equal probability.*

The Office Action concludes, absent any teaching or suggestion by Bergstrom, that since a substitute hop channel is chosen randomly, all hop channels have an equal probability of being randomly chosen.

The state matrix X (Fig. 2) and the corresponding description of Bergstrom does not provide information for reaching such a conclusion. Matrix X is described as containing information on presently permitting and prohibited frequencies (col. 2, lines 62-63) and is updated during a transmitting interval (col. 2, lines 59-61).

As described by Bergstrom, r_n is an integer in the interval 1 to N where N is the number of available frequencies (presumably, including both permitting and prohibited frequencies) in the frequency hopping system (col. 2, lines 62-65).

Matrix X is made up of three rows and N columns. The first row contains values for the mapping frequencies (presumably, allowable frequencies). The second row contains a quality measure, such as signal strength and jamming, of the corresponding mapping frequency. The third row contains a time index (col. 2, l. 62 - col. 3, l. 4).

When a new frequency value is generated (presumably a permitting frequency is generated as a forbidden hop channel is encountered perhaps?), the new frequency value is indicated (or, appears to be placed) in the r_n -th column (col. 3, lines 30-35).

Looking at Matrix X (not being described by Bergstrom), the frequency in the second slot is mapped to frequency in the third (next) slot. Therefore, it appears that if a prohibited frequency is encountered, then it is mapped to the next allowable frequency.

Matrix X, therefore, does not illustrate a forbidden hop channel being mapped onto each of the allowable hop channels with equal probability. Bergstrom fails to describe how

this mapping takes place including mapping a forbidden hop channel onto each of the allowable hop channels with equal probability.

At least for these reasons, Bergstrom simply fails to teach or suggest exemplary embodiments as recited in claim 1.


The deficiencies of Bergstrom are similarly applicable to claim 16.

All of the rejections having been overcome, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

A check in the amount of \$1520 is enclosed for the Notice of Appeal and the Petition for 3 month Extension of Time. It is believed no additional fees are due. If, however, the Office determines that additional fees are due, the Director is authorized to charge the additional fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2476.

Respectfully submitted,

Potomac Patent Group PLLC

By: 
Krishna Kalidindi
Reg. No. 41,461

P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
(703) 893-8500

Date: August 09, 2006